

Message (Digitally Signed)

From: Fukumoto, Janice L CIV NAVFAC HI, EV3 [janice.fukumoto@navy.mil]
Sent: 4/27/2018 11:21:33 PM
To: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix [Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov]; TU, LYNDSEY [Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov]; Linder, Steven [Linder.Steven@epa.gov]; Ichinotsubo, Lene K [lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov]
CC: Saguibo, Tracy-Joy I CIV NAVFAC HI, OPHE3 [tracyjoy.saguibo@navy.mil]; Waki, Cory K CIV NAVFAC HI, EV1 [cory.waki@navy.mil]
Subject: RE: Discussion Materials: Priorities for Red Hill Technical WG Meeting No. 5
Attachments: smime.p7s

Hope this allows for a productive discussion.

We are appreciative of the time Fenix spent yesterday discussing considerations to make the working group discussion most productive. As we discussed, the regulatory agency team has seen some of the ideas in some previous slides, however we were not able to go fully through some of our thought process/evaluation. It will be beneficial if we can get through showing our evaluation process then go through discussions.

Fenix had mentioned that the Navy has a probable explanation to the data, however there may be other equally probably explanations to the data. If after our discussion that is still the case, specifics in how the regulatory parties/SME's are looking/evaluating the data will be productive also.

Thanks.

VR, Janice Fukumoto, NAVFAC HI EV3, Environmental Restoration Program Manager, janice.fukumoto@navy.mil , (808) 471-3865

-----Original Message-----

From: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix [mailto:Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 12:27 PM
To: Saguibo, Tracy-Joy I CIV NAVFAC HI, OPHE3 <tracyjoy.saguibo@navy.mil>; Fukumoto, Janice L CIV NAVFAC HI, EV3 <janice.fukumoto@navy.mil>; Waki, Cory K CIV NAVFAC HI, EV1 <cory.waki@navy.mil>
Cc: TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>; Linder, Steven <Linder.Steven@epa.gov>; Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Discussion Materials: Priorities for Red Hill Technical WG Meeting No. 5

Thank you!

I glanced through the slides and see the q&a format you describe. I think the format will be very helpful. I will send these on to our SMEs immediately so they have an opportunity to review before our meeting.

Fenix

-----Original Message-----

From: Saguibo, Tracy-Joy I CIV NAVFAC HI, OPHE3 [mailto:tracyjoy.saguibo@navy.mil]
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 11:51 AM
To: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix <Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov>; Fukumoto, Janice L CIV NAVFAC HI, EV3 <janice.fukumoto@navy.mil>; Waki, Cory K CIV NAVFAC HI, EV1 <cory.waki@navy.mil>
Cc: TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>; Linder, Steven <Linder.Steven@epa.gov>; Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>
Subject: Discussion Materials: Priorities for Red Hill Technical WG Meeting No. 5

Hi Fenix,

Please see attached for our discussion materials for Monday's technical working group meeting; and thank you for the discussion yesterday and the questions/concerns/feedback provided this morning. We also appreciate the opportunity to discuss the newly updated evaluations and technical approach for input to the near-term TUA decision and the longer-term AOC SOW Sections 6/7 work. The Navy team will be prepared to discuss the points you outlined

this morning (as well as other technical items previously mentioned) on Monday, and hope to continue the productive technical discussions in effort to resolve technical areas of disagreement and how we can best move forward given an expedited timeline.

V/R,
Tracy Saguibo
NAVFAC HI EV3
D 808-471-1171 ext. 340
F 808.471.1160
E tracyjoy.saguibo@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix [mailto:Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 7:03 AM
To: Fukumoto, Janice L CIV NAVFAC HI, EV3 <janice.fukumoto@navy.mil>; Saguibo, Tracy-Joy I CIV NAVFAC HI, OPHE3 <tracyjoy.saguibo@navy.mil>; Waki, Cory K CIV NAVFAC HI, EV1 <cory.waki@navy.mil>
Cc: TU, LYNDESEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>; Linder, Steven <Linder.Steven@epa.gov>; Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Priorities for Red Hill Technical WG Meeting No. 5

Aloha Janice and Tracy,

Thank you for the chat yesterday afternoon about our SMEs areas of concern and focus for the upcoming AOC technical meeting on Monday. We understand the need to balance our time together to allow the Navy to present new and updated information and at the same time address the key open questions we have on the agenda items. With that in mind, Lyndsey and I have gathered the following feedback from our SMEs and ask you to be ready to address these questions and issues as key components of our discussion.

1. How has the technical approach changed to accommodate the potential that a portion of the 2014 release impacted groundwater, inclusive of prior releases?
2. How has the NAPL transport approach changed to consider dynamic flow aspects analogous to what the groundwater transport model will consider?
3. What are the error bounds/certainty on the 27,000 gallon release value for 2014, and how are potential release volumes determined for scenario evaluations?

It would be helpful to have a list of the key areas in which the Navy and its consultants have revisited or revised their methods based upon prior and particularly recent input from the regulatory agencies, and where those areas and revisions will be highlighted in the presentation. Particular areas of emphasis for the Regulatory Agencies are (a) the design and form of the LNAPL model and (b) the role and results of the Monte-Carlo application of that model.

The Navy and its consultants should highlight in this presentation what steps have been taken to move from the initial box-model LNAPL release analysis toward something more physically realistic that it would be possible to envision playing a role in defining source terms for the ultimate groundwater fate-and-transport analysis.

In addition, If the 2014 release event is to be used as an example either for calibration, weighting of potential release scenarios, or in any other manner - particularly in the context of a Monte-Carlo type of framework, then the uncertainty in the volume released in 2014 should also be incorporated in that analysis.

The regulatory agencies will be looking to hear from the Navy and its consultants what steps have been taken and efforts made to either discriminate between the various release scenarios, or to corroborate their interpretations of the fate of LNAPL releases, using existing analytical data. We would anticipate this would focus on the 2014 release but may include earlier data given that evidence of earlier impacts to groundwater exists. This is particularly important to the regulatory agencies given that the LNAPL conceptual and transport models are anticipated to ultimately play a role in defining the source term for the groundwater model.

We are looking forward to receiving the slide deck (even if in progress) and any other additional material available to review in advance of this meeting, and appreciate the efforts that have been made so far to provide agendas and slides in advance. We also appreciate receiving the additional data from the groundwater monitoring, which we received today from Margie Pascua and look forward to receiving the additional large datasets on hard drives or other portable media on Monday at DOH and having copies mailed to EPA at the same time.

Feel free to call if you have questions or would like to discuss further.

Thanks,

Fenix Grange, Program Manager

Hazard Evaluation Emergency Response Office

808-586-4248 Direct Line

808-282-8879 Work Cell